DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 800 HE 012 192

TITLE Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College? A Report on a University of California Survey of the High School Class of '75.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 74p.; Document prepared by the Office of Outreach Services

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; Cohort Analysis; *College Choice; Economic Factors; Eligibility; *Enrollment Rate; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *High School Graduates; Minority Groups; Performance Factors; Public Education; *State Colleges; *State Surveys; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *California State College and University System

ABSTRACT

In a study of California's high school class of 1975, the rate at which students in different ethnic and economic groups attained eligibility within institutions of the California state college and university system (CSUS) was examined. Responses were received from 4,131 graduates, about two-thirds of the mailing sample. Results of the survey revealed that 40 percent of the graduates of the class of 1975 are in California community colleges, 23 percent did not enroll in college, and 15 percent are in a public four-year institution. Factors affecting the postsecondary decisions of the class of 1975, including academic achievement in high school and non-academic factors, such as experiences in school, and influential people, are considered. Among factors in the selection of a particular college, 57 percent cited program and 55 percent listed locale. Among major findings of the survey were that California's program works equally well for minority and non-minority high-achieving students, but less than one-third as well with less-achieving minority counterparts. The survey instrument and a brief glossary of terms are appended. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181800

BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION: WHO GOES TO COLLEGE ?

A Report on a University of California
Survey of the High School
Class of '75

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Univ of Calif
Office of Outreach Services
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 192

BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION:
WHO GOES TO COLLEGE?

A Report on a University of California
Survey of the High School
Class of '75

Office of Outreach Services
University of California
Systemwide Administration
May, 1978

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEMWIDE ADMINISTRATION

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Office of the President

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

April 17, 1978

Dear Friend:

In 1976, the University of California initiated a survey of 1975 high school graduates requesting information on their high school and post-high school activities. Our main purpose was to secure information on the rate at which students from different ethnic and economic groups attained University eligibility--information which we saw as vital to the evaluation and future direction of our Student Affirmative Action effort.

The results of our study are disturbing, for they substantiate many of our fears about the status of educational opportunity in the State of California. Because of inadequate preparation and achievement in high school, many minority and low-income youngsters and many youngsters whose parents have little formal education continue to be ineligible to attend our universities and four-year colleges. In spite of the passage of over two decades since the historic decision in Brown v. Board of Education, educational opportunity is more a myth than a reality for many Californians.

We in the University of California are deeply concerned about the problems pointed to in this study. In our view, the situation is so serious that an unprecedented cooperative effort--on the part of schools, colleges, parents, and the students themselves--will be needed to ameliorate the problem.

The first report on the results of our research contains only a description of our major findings. Our goal was to produce at the earliest possible date a summary of the critical problem areas. Later, the data will be subjected to more detailed analysis. During the next six months, University personnel will distribute this first report widely to concerned citizens and use it as a basis for joint discussions of corrective strategies. We hope you will join us in this effort.

Sincerely,

David S. Saxon

David S. Saxon
President

ELIGIBILITY SURVEY REPORT

Table of Contents

		Pages
i.	Introduction and Preview of Major Findings	1- 4
ii.	Background and Methodology	5-10
I.	What are Members of the Class of '75 Doing Now?	11-15
II.	Factors Affecting the Postsecondary Decisions of the Class of '75	16-34
	A. Academic Achievement in High School	
	B. Non-Academic Factors	
	1. Experiences in School	
	2. Influential People	
	3. Educational Aspirations	
III.	Selection Among Available Educational Options	35-43
	A. Reasons for Selecting a Particular College	
	B. Colleges Actually Selected by the Graduates	
IV.	Comments from the Graduates	44-47
V.	Conclusions	48
	Appendices	

1. INTRODUCTION AND PREVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS

I. Introduction and Preview of Major Findings

One of the most important functions of public education is to provide young citizens with equal opportunities--and equal skills--regardless of their respective backgrounds. The results of our study of a cross-section of 1975 California high school graduates suggest that California's system of education has failed to achieve this end. Previous studies indicate that minority and low-income students drop out of high school at a rate significantly higher than that of other students. We found that those who do graduate achieve UC and CSUC eligibility[1] at a much lower rate than their counterparts. We also found that, after graduation, proportionately fewer minority and low-income students enroll in college than do other students. In short, minority and low-income students, and students whose parents have not attended college, are being excluded from a wide range of postsecondary activities because of the inadequacy of their academic preparation and achievement in high school. This exclusion is likely to perpetuate current divisions among the races and economic classes.

A. What is the Major Barrier to Genuine Educational Opportunity?

In examining postsecondary activity patterns for members of the Class of '75, we found no significant differences in the activities of high achieving minority and low-income graduates and those of other high achieving graduates. (Over 50 percent of the UC and CSUC-eligible students enrolled in four-year colleges or universities; less than 7 percent did not enroll anywhere). If anything, high achieving minority and low-income students tend to enroll in the more prestigious postsecondary institutions at a slightly higher rate than their classmates.

Students in the lower achievement groups (ineligible for either UC or CSUC) also enroll in collegiate institutions at similar rates regardless of race or economic status. As is true of the higher achievement groups, minority students in this group tend to enroll in college--and, in particular, in the more prestigious colleges--at a slightly higher rate than white students.

Somehow, the extensive special recruitment programs mounted by California colleges and universities--and the substantial financial aid commitments of the institutions and the State and Federal Governments--have combined with parent support and high school guidance systems to produce an effective system of access for graduates <u>within achievement group</u>. In other words, California's educational system works with equal effectiveness for students of equal achievement regardless of race or economic status.

The critical flaw in the California system is found in the fact that students of different races and socio-economic backgrounds are not

---

[1] See Glossary in Appendix B for description of UC and CSUC admission requirements. UC- and CSUC-eligible students are students who, upon graduating from high school, met all of the requirements for admission to those institutions.

distributed evenly among the achievement groups. Low-income and minority high school graduates appear in the highest achievement group (UC eligibles) with only one-third the frequency of their more advantaged counterparts and in the second highest achievement group (CSUC eligibles) with less than one-half the frequency. At the same time, these students are considerably more likely to fall into the lowest achievement group (ineligible to attend either UC or CSUC).

Our study suggests that the problem now is to modify the educational system in such a way that it works with equal effectiveness for all students. That system must begin immediately to deal with the differential achievement problem, for unless these achievement disparities are eliminated, minority and low-income students will not participate equally in California's system of post-secondary education. And because non-participants will continue to be relegated to lower-paying jobs and will be excluded from obtaining the skills requisite for entry into graduate and professional schools, inequalities among the races will persist.

B. What Can be Done to Eliminate This Barrier?

On the basis of data from the current study, it is perhaps somewhat easier to identify strategies which will not reduce underrepresentation than it is to suggest fool-proof means of eliminating the major obstacle to increased representation: differential achievement rates. The primary problem facing California is clearly not, for example, a recruitment problem, nor does it revolve around the provision of more and better information to high school seniors on institutional choices or financial aid programs. Corrective strategies must extend more deeply into the educational structure.

The problem of differential eligibility attainment is incredibly complex. As such, its correction must be seen not simply as a responsibility of California's junior and senior high schools, but as a priority responsibility for the State, its educational and business institutions, and its people. Equal Educational Opportunity is a basic right for children throughout the State--a right which must be guaranteed through unprecedented cooperative action of institutions and individuals.

Utilizing responses to our survey, we have identified five elements which must be addressed in this cooperative strategy. As noted above, none of these five critical components is or can be the sole responsibility of a single institution or individual. Perhaps the clearest example of the extent to which responsibility for those matters is intertwined can be found in instruction, an area which many would say is the sole responsibility of the school. Certainly, instruction has been and should continue to be the primary responsibility of the schools. But if, as respondents to our survey suggest, the content of this instruction is to be related more closely to that of college-level instruction and if teachers are to be well-prepared to deal supportively with the special needs of students in certain subgroups, collegiate institutions must become directly involved in this area.

The five critical components of any solution are as follows:

1. Aspirations

There are substantial differences in the postsecondary educational aspirations of students from different sub-groups. Over 75 percent of Asian graduates and 61 percent of Blacks planned on obtaining at least a Bachelor's degree. Only 36 percent of the Chicanos, on the other hand, had similar aspirations. Clearly, these aspirations are in large measure a function of background --parent's educational and economic status--and experience. If progress is to be made, the educational aspirations of Chicano students--the lowest of all ethnic groups--must be raised.

2. Information

High educational aspirations are of limited use unless students are informed of the postsecondary opportunities available to them, what different opportunities mean, and how to prepare for those opportunities. As many survey respondents pointed out, such information must be made available to and be understood by all students by at least the ninth grade, the point at which critical academic choices must often be made. Judging from the survey results, priority must be placed upon provision of such information not only to Chicano students, whose aspirations are pitifully low, but to Black students, whose aspirations appear all too often to be totally unconnected to achievement.

3. Instruction

Clearly, students who are motivated to prepare for postsecondary education and who are informed of the coursework required to achieve that end, must have the opportunity to obtain the necessary instruction. Respondents to the survey strongly recommended that high school instruction must be connected more directly to college-level instruction. Many felt that they were let off too easily by their high school instructors.

4. Effort

In order for educational opportunity to become a reality, students must put forth the individual effort to utilize available information and instruction in the fullest possible way. Survey respondents who, for example, "didn't try" to see a counselor (over 25 percent), bear some responsibility for the outcomes of their educational experience. Institutional efforts to provide information and instruction require equal effort on the part of the student.

5. Support

Students who exert effort to acquire the academic skills necessary to pursue postsecondary options, must receive both academic and personal support for that effort. Academic resources, like tutoring and skills development, may be a critical link for many students. And the support of school personnel and, in particular, parents is vitally important.

Cooperative solutions to the problem of differential achievement are essential if equal educational opportunity is to become a reality in the State of California. Interinstitutional efforts--like the University of California's Partnership Program, the California Writing Project, the Mathematics Engineering and Science Achievement Program, and other existing and future activities which seek to deepen the meaning of interinstitutional "articulation"--must be strengthened and encouraged. For all will ultimately play a part in determining the fate of hundreds of thousands of young Californians.

We hope the survey results summarized above and on the following pages will provide the reader with a better understanding of some of the major barriers to equal educational opportunity in California. More important, we hope that this information will motivate the reader--whether he or she is a member of the educational community, a parent or a student--to become actively involved in solving the problem. My thanks to the Survey Research Center--in particular to Mr. Bill Nicholls and Mr. Frank Many--and to Mr. Carnegie Ouye of this office, who did most of our work on the survey, for making possible the presentation of this report.

Kati Haycock
Coordinator, Outreach Services
UC Systemwide Administration

11. BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

II. Background and Methodology

A. Background

The California Master Plan for Higher Education assigns to each of the State's segments of public postsecondary education a specific mandate with respect to undergraduate education. To the University of California (UC), it assigns the education of students from among the top 12-1/2 percent of the high school graduating class, as well as students who complete necessary preparation at a community college. The California State University and College System (CSUC) is charged by the Master Plan with the education of students from among the top 33-1/3 percent of the high school graduating class, and also community college transfer students. All adults in California are eligible to attend a community college.

In 1975, the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) initiated a study of the 1974-75 public high school graduating class in California which was designed to determine whether current admissions standards were in keeping with the Master Plan assignments. With assistance from the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, the transcripts of some 10,000 graduates of the Class of '75 were reviewed as if the graduates were applicants for admission to the two institutions. On the basis of this review, admissions evaluators in the two segments determined whether or not each graduate was eligible to attend either institution. The "CPEC Eligibility Study" indicated that some 14.8 percent of the graduates were eligible to attend the University of California and some 35 percent were eligible to attend the State University and Colleges.

Because of concern about educational opportunities for disadvantaged students, University of California representatives to the Technical Advisory Committee for the CPEC Eligibility Study requested from the beginning that the Commission's study be designed to collect and analyze that both academic and demographic information on the sample population. However, neither CPEC nor CSUC representatives on the planning committee viewed demographic data as essential, thus the CPEC Eligibility Study was not designed to collect racial, economic, or other demographic information.

After some thought, University officials determined that data on the ethnic composition of the eligibility pool and on factors which limit post-secondary opportunities of low-income and minority students were critical to the evaluation--and future direction--of student affirmative action programs. Therefore, the University decided to mount a survey of its own to collect these additional data.

B. Methodology

A technical report on the design and implementation of the University's study was prepared by the Survey Research Center and can be obtained

from the University of California Systemwide Administration (Office of Outreach Services) upon request. In the interest of simplicity, however, the following is provided as a summary of survey activities.

Several possible options for collecting the desired information on the 9,965[2] participants in the CPEC sample were considered, including obtaining information from school sources, phone and mail surveys. After careful thought, University staff members determined that a mail questionnaire stood the greatest chance of success. Using this technique, questionnaire responses would be combined with transcript information to provide a detailed picture of the Class of '75.

After deciding on a general strategy, the next step was to secure names and "last-known addresses" for individuals in the sample population. At the request of the University, CPEC built into its instructions to the schools a request that, when student transcripts were sent to CPEC, the names and addresses of the students should be sent to the University. This process resulted in name and address list of 8667 graduates, for limitations in the design and processing of the CPEC study caused certain students to be excluded and in some cases schools were reluctant to provide names and addresses. A total of 13 percent of the sample was lost in this manner. An additional 1.8 percent were excluded from the survey because they had died or permanently left California before the survey was mailed or denied in response to the survey that they graduated between the requested dates.

Initial work on the survey instrument was done by staff members in the University's Student Affirmative Action unit--the unit charged with responsibility for the entire project. Then, with the assistance of professionals from the University's Survey Research Center in Berkeley and West Coast Community Survey, Inc. and advice from a special consultant (Dr. Gerald Hersh-Cezar), the final survey instrument was developed (Appendix A).

Questionnaires were mailed to 6115 graduates. The mailing sample included (a) all available UC-eligible graduates; (b) all available CSUC-eligible graduates; (c) all graduates eligible for neither institution who attended a high school with a 40 percent or more non-Asian minority enrollment and (d) a 45.5 percent sample of all remaining ineligible graduates. Questionnaire mailings were undertaken in two waves. First, a pilot survey of 968 graduates was initiated in Fall of 1976. Second, the main survey of 5147 graduates began in Winter, 1977.

Initial mailings to the full sample were followed by reminders and additional mailings to non-respondents. Students who had moved and

---

[2]The CPEC sample consisted of 10,233 persons who graduated from California public high schools between July 1, 1974 and June 30, 1975. High school transcripts were obtained for 9,965 graduates, or 97.6 percent of the sample.

had not left forwarding addresses were traced via voter registration records and Department of Motor Vehicles records. In the final months of the survey, phone contacts were made with many non-respondents. Follow-up contacts continued through the Summer of 1977.

By the conclusion of the project, completed questionnaires were received from 4131 graduates. This constituted about two-thirds of the mailing sample after graduates who had died or moved from California and those denying graduation between the required dates were excluded. As had been expected, the response rate was higher for high-achieving students than low-achievers. Response rates are listed by eligibility strata in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1

COMBINED FIELD OUTCOMES OF PILOT AND FINAL SURVEYS
BY REVISED ELIGIBILITY STATUS

Field Outcome	UC Eligible	Other CSUC Eligible	Ineligibles Minority High School	Ineligibles Other	Totals Unweighted	Totals Weighted[a]
Total sample.....	1,358	1,803	897	2,057	6,115	8,667
Known Out of Population						
Numbers						
Total.....	15	28	8	48	99	159
Moved from California, died..	7	13	2	28	50	85
Incorrect graduation date....	8	15	6	20	49	74
Percent of Total Sample						
Total known out of population..	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	2.3%	1.6%	1.8%
Moved from California, died..	0.5%	0.7%	0.2%	1.3%	0.8%	1.0%
Incorrect graduation date....	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Assumed in Population[b]						
Numbers						
Total.....	1,343	1,775	889	2,009	6,016	8,508
Complete questionnaire.....	1,158	1,354	448	1,171	4,131	5,584
Refused, incomplete quest'nre	19	42	50	75	187	281
No response.....	111	246	230	513	1,100	1,736
Post Offc. return, unlocatab.	55	133	161	249	598	907
Percent in Population						
Total.....	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Complete questionnaire.....	86.2%	76.3%	50.4%	58.3%	68.7%	65.6%
Refused, incomplete quest'nre	1.4%	2.4%	5.6%	3.8%	3.1%	3.3%
No response.....	8.1%	13.8%	25.9%	25.5%	18.3%	20.4%
Post Offc. return, unlocatab.	4.1%	7.5%	18.1%	12.4%	9.9%	10.7%
Percent complete among locatable persons in the population.....	89.9%	82.5%	61.5%	66.6%	76.3%	73.5%

[a]Results weighted to the total available sample of the 1976 CPEC Eligibility Study

[b]These are graduates not known to be out of the population

Return rates undoubtedly would have been higher if questionnaire mailing could have begun sooner. Due to delays in the High School Eligibility Study, first questionnaires reached June 1975 graduates about 16 months after they had graduated and summer 1974 graduates about 27-30 months after they left high school. By this point, many graduates no longer resided at the same address and were unlocatable. Almost a fifth of the minority high school ineligibles were unlocatable, contributing to the low return rate for this group.

The survey results have been case-weighted for: the subsampling of nonminority high school ineligibles, the varying return rates by eligibility status, type of high school among ineligibles, sex, and grade point average and for the subsampling of nonminority high school ineligibles. The weights also have been ratio-adjusted to reproduce the UC and CSUC eligibility rates of the 1976 High School Eligibility Study as reported by the California Postsecondary Education Commission for all California public high school graduates and those in six geographic regions of the state.

Weighting cannot fully compensate for nonresponse losses. Since much higher return rates were obtained for eligible than for ineligible graduates, the Expanded Eligibility Survey provides more trustworthy descriptions of the UC and CSUC eligibility pools than of ineligible graduates or all graduates combined. For example, when weighted results for all graduates are compared with 1973 seniors in the California Department of Education's Racial Census, the Expanded Eligibility Survey appears to adequately represent most ethnic groups. However, Black graduates, especially Black males, appear to be underrepresented. Table 2 provides comparison data.

TABLE 2

ESTIMATED ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF 1974-75 GRADUATES COMPARED WITH RESULTS OF THE 1973 RACIAL CENSUS FOR HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

Ethnicity	1974-75 Graduates Weighted Estimates from the Expanded Eligibility Survey (1)	1973 Seniors Department of Education Racial Census (2)	Difference (1) - (2) (3)
Black.....	5.1%	7.9%	-2.8
Chicano/Latino/Filipino.	13.8	12.7	+1.1
Asian.....	4.1	3.1	+1.0
Anglo and other.....	77.0	76.3	0.7
Total.....	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
Sample size.....	(4,131)	(281,721)	--

To estimate UC and CSUC eligibility rates for major ethnic groups, weighted results of the Expanded Eligibility Survey were further adjusted for the apparent ethnicity of nonrespondents determined from surnames and projections from response trends.

It should be noted that, in some instances, data are provided on the Pilipino population. Due to the small numbers of such students in the sample, these should be treated with some caution. For this reason, Pilipinos were excluded from the tables whenever the population had to be subdivided. No data are provided on the American Indian population, for numbers in the sample were far too small to permit reliable analysis. Much to our regret, a separative study would be necessary to obtain accurate information on the American Indian population.

I. WHAT ARE MEMBERS OF THE CLASS OF '75 DOING NOW?

I. What are Members of the Class of '75 Doing Now?[3]

A. Postsecondary Activities of the Class of '75

In view of the high survey response rates for high achieving graduates, the data presented in this section on the postsecondary activities of UC- and CSUC-eligible graduates should be very accurate. The lower response rates for the ineligible population, together with the tendency of persons with more successful lives to respond to survey and than persons who are less successful by traditional standards, may tend to inflate the college-going rates of the ineligible population. Data on the ineligible population should therefore be treated by the reader as a high estimate of college attendance.

* Of the total graduating class, approximately three-quarters attended school on a part- or full-time basis. The majority of these students attended public institutions in California.

TABLE 1.1

Postsecondary Activities
of the Class of '75

Postsecondary Activities	Percent of Grads
enrolled in a public 4 year college or university in California	15%
enrolled in a California Community College	49
enrolled in a private college or university in California	4
enrolled in an out-of-state college or university	3
enrolled in a vocational school	6
did not enroll in college	23
Total	100
(Unweighted sample size)	(4131)

* Virtually all of the graduates who attended 4 year colleges and Universities did so on a full-time basis. Of those students who

[3]Because many of the graduates attended more than one postsecondary educational institution, the tables in this section have been constructed using data on the institution attended by each graduate for the longest period of time after graduation. In addition, as with most remaining tables in this chapter, percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

attended Community Colleges or vocational training institutions, approximately three-quarters did so on a full-time basis.

B. Variations in Postsecondary Activities by Race

* College attendance rates for members of the Class of '75 varied significantly among students of different ethnic groups. Asian students had the highest college-going rate of any ethnic group. Chicano students had the lowest college-going rate.

TABLE 1.2

Postsecondary Activities of
Students From Different Ethnic Groups

Postsecondary Activity	Black	Chicano	Latino	Asian	PI	White/Other
enrolled in public 4 year	18%	9%	11%	31%	18%	14%
enrolled in CCC	54	52	49	52	45	50
enrolled in private	3	3	4	4	3	4
enrolled out-of-state	4	2	2	2	0	3
enrolled in voc. school	10	3	10	3	12	5
did not enroll	11	26	24	8	22	24
Total	100 (197)	100 (356)	100 (94)	100 (224)	100 (42)	100 (3218)

It should be noted that, although the high rate at which Black students enter public 4-year institutions may seem to contradict information presented later in this report on the low rate at which Black students attain UC and CSUC eligibility, the two are actually compatible. The difference is explained by the significant number of Black students admitted to UC and CSUC by "special action"--in exception to regular requirements. Without such programs the Chicano enrollment rate would also be substantially reduced.

C. Variations in Postsecondary Activities by Sex

* There were few significant differences in the postsecondary enrollment patterns of male and female graduates. However, proportionately more women attended vocational schools than did their male counterparts. More men did not obtain any postsecondary education.

TABLE 1.3

Postsecondary Activities of
Male and Female Graduates

Postsecondary Activity	Men	Women
enrolled in public 4 year	15%	14%
enrolled in CCC	50	50
enrolled in private	4	4
enrolled out-of-state	2	3
enrolled in voc. school	4	7
did not enroll	25	22
Total	100 (1835)	100 (2296)

* There were no major differences in the decisions of male and female graduates to attend school on a part- or full-time basis.

D. Variations in Postsecondary Activities by Economic Background

* The economic background of the graduates correlates significantly with their postsecondary activities. Upper income students were more likely to attend college than were their lower-income counterparts, particularly four-year institutions. In fact, students from families earning in excess of $25,000 per year were more than three times as likely to attend 4 year institutions as were students from families earning less than $6,000 per year. Students from low-income families were more likely to attend vocational schools than other students.

TABLE 1.4

Postsecondary Activities
of Graduates from Different
Economic Groups

Postsecondary Activity	<$6000	$6-11,999	$12-17,999	$18-24,999	25,000+
enrolled in public 4 year	8%	10%	13%	15%	25%
enrolled at CCC	52	46	51	56	47
enrolled at private	3	4	4	3	5
enrolled out-of-state	2	3	2	2	5
enrolled in voc. school	10	5	6	5	4
did not enroll	25	32	24	19	14
Total	100 (250)	100 (688)	100 (1046)	100 (965)	100 (895)

* The full-time/part-time attendance ratios did not differ significantly among economic groups, with one exception: students from the lowest-income families were more likely to attend school full-time than all other economic groups. (This phenomenon may be due, at least in part, to restrictions on financial aid to part-time students.)

E. Variations in Postsecondary Activities by Academic Achievement in High School

* Virtually all--98.6 percent--of the graduates in the upper one-eighth of their class (i.e. those who were UC-eligible) entered college after graduation. By way of contrast, over 32 percent of the students in the bottom two-thirds of their class (i.e. neither UC nor CSUC-eligible) did not enter any college. UC-eligible students were twice as likely to enter a four-year institution as CSUC-eligible students.

TABLE 1.5

Postsecondary Activities of Students in Different Achievement Groups

Postsecondary Activity	UC eligible	CSUC (not UC) eligible	Ineligible
enrolled in public 4 year	56%	27%	4%
enrolled at CCC	23	47	53
enrolled at private	12	7	2
enrolled out-of-state	7	5	3
enrolled at voc. school	1	3	6
did not enroll	1	11	32
Total	100 (1158)	100 (1354)	100 (1619)

II. FACTORS AFFECTING THE POSTSECONDARY DECISIONS OF THE CLASS OF '75

II. Factors Affecting the Postsecondary Decisions of the Class of '75

A. Academic Achievement in High School

Most formal postsecondary education in California takes place in one of five different types of institutions, each of which has unique functions and admissions standards:

- The University of California: is the primary state-supported research and graduate training institution. It has extensive undergraduate programs, and is charged with the education of students from the top 12-1/2 percent of the high school graduating class.

- The California State University and Colleges: has 19 campuses located throughout the State, offering a wide variety of undergraduate and master's level programs. It draws its undergraduate students from the top 33-1/3 percent of the high school graduating class.

- The California Community Colleges: include 106 two-year institutions serving communities throughout the State. All adults in California are eligible to enroll in a Community College.

- Independent Colleges and Universities: include more than 52 private institutions, with a variety of educational programs and offerings. Some offer undergraduate instruction only; others offer an array of graduate and professional programs.

- Proprietary Institutions: are private agencies offering vocational training programs. Such programs generally lead to certificates of competency.

Due to this differentiation of function among institutions, and to corresponding variations in entrance requirements, high school preparation plays a large part in determining what a student can do after graduation. Of course, just because a student is eligible to attend a particular institution does not necessarily mean he or she will ultimately do so. The student might not even to go college. Eligibility does, however, determine one's options--particularly with respect to public higher education.

The CPEC Eligibility Study determined that approximately 14.8 percent of the members of the Class of '75 were eligible to attend the University of California. A total of 35 percent were eligible to attend the State University and College System. However, the eligibility rate differed for students of different ethnic, economic, and educational backgrounds.

Ethnic Differences

Table 2.1 contains information on the rate at which students of different ethnic groups attained UC and CSUC eligibility. Because, as noted on page 9 , the weighted estimates from this study proved somewhat at variance from other sources of information on the ethnic composition of public high school students (i.e. Blacks appeared to be underrepresented), steps were taken to construct a cross-tabulation of ethnicity by eligibility status drawing on information beyond the weighted estimates.

Two additional procedures were used. First, the name of each unlocatable and non-responding sample graduate was reviewed to identify those with Spanish or Asian surnames. These counts were then used to adjust the estimates of Spanish (Chicano, Latino, or Filipino) and Asian-American graduates by eligibility status. Second, a linear regression projection method was employed to estimate the numbers of Black graudates in each eligibility status from trends in the percent of Black graduates responding to each successive questionnaire mailing. This projection method provides results of less certain accuracy, but appeared to be the best alternative with available information. Further details are provided in the technical report.

TABLE 2.1

UC and CSUC Eligibility Rates for Graduates from Different Ethnic Groups: Adjusted, Weighted Estimates

Ethnicity of Graduates	UC eligibility rate	CSUC eligibility rate	N
Black	5.0%	13.4%	(197)
Chicano/Latino	4.7	18.5	(450)
Pilipino	6.6	29.2	(42)
Asian	39.0	61.0	(224)
White/Other	16.5	38.6	(3242)
Total	14.8	35.0	(4131)

As is evident in this table, Black and Chicano students achieved UC eligibility at less than one-third the rate of white students. More than one of every three Asian graduates, on the other hand, attained University eligibility.

Similar patterns hold for the CSUC system, where only 13.4 percent of Black graduates and 18.5 percent of Chicano/Latino graduates met CSUC requirements. 37.9 percent of the white graduates met these same requirements. Thus, the Black and Hispanic eligibility rates for CSUC were less than one-half the white rate. Differential eligibility rates among graduates are particularly disturbing in view of the fact that minority students who enter high school complete graduation requirements at a much lower rate than white students. Previous studies have suggested that nearly one-half of Chicano/Latino students drop-out of high school before graduating.

Table 2.2 provides summary information on the ethnic characteristics of the UC and CSUC eligibility pools.

TABLE 2.2

Ethnic Composition of UC and CSUC Eligibility Pools
Adjusted, Weighted Estimates

	UC eligibility pool	CSUC eligibility pool
Percent Black	2.5	2.8
Percent Latino/Chicano	4.0	6.7
Percent Pilipino	0.5	0.9
Percent Asian	9.4	6.3
Percent White/Other	83.6	83.3
Total	100 (1158)	100 (2502)

It is important to note that a number of students (342 in addition to the 1484 students already eligible) would have been eligible to attend the University of California if they had completed one or two more high school courses. Generally, these students had sufficient grade-point averages to gain entry, but lacked sufficient coursework. Deficiencies occurred most commonly in the following areas: Advanced Course, English, Foreign Language, and Math.

Table 2.3 provides information on the number of students, by race, who had sufficient grades to enter the University, but lacked 1.9 or fewer units of coursework. The patterns for Black and Chicano students differ only slightly from those of White students. The former were more often deficient in Mathematics than in English, the latter the reverse.

It is important to note, however, that the proportion of minority students who would attain eligibility if they took one more course or so does not differ from the proportion of other students who would become so eligible. Thus, elimination of one of the "A-F" requirements would not appear to increase the proportionate representation of ethnic minorities in the UC eligibility pool.

TABLE 2.3

Graduates with A-F GPA $\geq$ 3.1
and Subject Deficiencies $\leq$ 1.9,
By Race (weighted figures)

	Black	Chicano/ Latino	Asian	Fil.	White/ Other
A requirement (U.S. History)	0	0	0	0	7
B requirement (English)	0	2	8	1	69
C requirement (Math)	2	3	0	0	41
D requirement (Lab Science)	0	1	5	2	34
E requirement (Foreigh Language)	4	6	5	0	66
F requirement (Advanced Course in Math, Science, Lang.)	1	7	0	0	78

Factors Affecting Postsecondary Decisions -- Academic Achievement in High School

Economic Differences

Like racial minorities, low-income graduates had lower eligibility rates--and, thus, fewer postsecondary options--than upper income students. Table 2.4 provides data on the rate at which graduates at different income levels attained eligibility for UC and CSUC.

TABLE 2.4

UC and CSUC Eligibility Rates
for Graduates from Different Economic Groups

Annual Family Income	UC eligibility rate	CSUC eligibility rate
$6,000	4%	17%
$6 - 11,999	9	28
$12 - 17,999	13	34
$18 - 24,999	19	41
$25,000+	26	47
TOTAL	14.8 (1115)	35.0 (2394)

Using these data, it is possible to determine that the economic status of a student's family is directly correlated with that student's subsequent eligibility status. With increasing amounts of family income, a student's chances of attaining UC or CSUC eligibility are markedly increased. Students from the highest income category ($25,000+) achieve UC eligibility at over six times the rate of students in the lowest income category (less than $6000). Differences in CSUC eligibility rates, while not so pronounced, are also significant.

Factors Affecting Postsecondary Decisions -- Academic Achievement in High School

Table 2.5 provides summary information on the economic characteristics of the two eligibility pools.

TABLE 2.5

Economic Composition of UC and CSUC Eligibility Pools

	UC eligibility pool	CSUC eligibility pool
Percent under $6,000	2%	4%
Percent $6-11,999	11	15
Percent $12-17,999	23	26
Percent $18-24,999	29	27
Percent $25,000 +	35	28
TOTAL	14.8 (1115)	35 (2394)

The Interplay Between Race and Income

The information in Table 2.6 provides some insights into the relationship between race and income as they affect a student's eligibility status. It is clear from this information that family income is directly correlated with the high school achievement of both minority and Anglo students. For example, minority students in the upper income categories achieved UC eligibility at a far greater rate than those in the lower income categories.

TABLE 2.6

The Interplay Between Race and Income
In Determining UC and CSUC Eligibility

	<$6,000	$6,000-11,999	$12,000-17,999	$18,000-24,999	$25,000+
UC Eligibility Rate					
Minority (Black and Hispanic) Students	2%	5%	5%	8%	20%
White Students	7	11	13	19	25
Total Student Population	4	9	13	19	26
CSUC Eligibility Rate					
Minority (Black and Hispanic) Students	11	18	21	21	35
White Students	24	33	34	43	46
Total Student Population	17	28	34	41	47

However, within given income categories, minority students consistently achieved UC and CSUC eligibility at a lower rate than white students. Black and Chicano students from families earning less than $6,000 per year achieved UC eligibility at a rate of 2 percent and CSUC eligibility at a rate of 11 percent. The comparable figures for White students from families earning less than $6,000 were 7 percent (UC) and 24 percent (CSUC). This trend, where White students within an income category achieve UC/CSUC eligibility at over twice the rate of minority students in the same economic bracket, holds for all but the highest income category ($25,000 or more per year). Clearly, race does play a part in determining the achievement levels of high school students.

Differences Between The Sexes

In examining data on the highest achievers--students eligible to attend UC--it is clear that, while women graduates outnumbered the men, the differences were not substantial. Of those students who met the University's admissions requirements, 53 percent were women and 47 percent were men. Women in the Class of '75 achieved University eligibility at a rate of 15 percent; men at a rate of 14 percent.

The CSUC eligible population is, however, quite different. Of those students eligible to attend CSUC but not eligible to attend UC, over 61 percent were women. While the full CSUC population has a larger proportion of men (58 percent women; 42 percent men), it is still far from balanced. Tables 2.6 and 2.7 provide summary information on eligibility status by sex.

TABLE 2.7

UC and CSUC Eligibility Rates
for Male and Female Graduates

Sex of Graduates	UC eligibility rate	CSUC eligibility rate	N
Women	15%	39%	(1835)
Men	14	30	(2296)
Total	14.8	35.0	(4131)

TABLE 2.8

Sexual Composition of UC and
CSUC Eligibility Pools

	UC eligibility pool	[CSUC but not UC eligible]	CSUC eligibility pool
Percent Men	47%	[39%]	42%
Percent Women	53	[61]	58
TOTAL	100 (1158)	100 (1354)	100 (2512)

Differences Related to Parental Education

The level of education attained by the mothers and fathers of members of the Class of '75 correlates significantly with the eligibility status of the graduates. The parents of the Class of '75 represent a good cross-section of educational levels. Approximately one-fifth of the graduates came from families where at least one parent did not graduate from high school. A similar number had one parent with a Bachelors or Advanced degree. The remainder were distributed in between.

As is evident in Tables 2.9 and 2.10, students whose mothers and fathers did not graduate from high school achieved UC eligibility at a rate substantially lower than students whose parents graduated and attended college. Graduates whose fathers and mothers had obtained a bachelors degree were approximately four times as likely to attain UC eligibility as those whose parents did not complete high school. And of the students who had one or more parent with an advanced degree, over one-third attained UC eligibility; the comparable eligibility figure for students whose parents did not complete high school was approximately 6 percent.

Similar trends, though not so pronounced, hold true for CSUC eligibility status. Students whose parents had obtained a bachelor's degree attained CSUC eligibility at more than twice the rate of students whose parents did not graduate from high school.

TABLE 2.9

Eligibility Status as a
Function of Father's Education

	Not there	0-7	8th	H.S.	H.S. Grad.	Some College	AA	BA/BS	Adv.
UC elig. rate	8%	6%	6%	6%	10%	15%	15%	23%	37%
CSUC elig. rate	25	21	22	23	28	36	39	47	63
Inelig. rate	75	79	78	77	72	64	61	53	37
TOTAL	100 (256)	100 (242)	100 (151)	100 (348)	100 (893)	100 (652)	100 (246)	100 (579)	100 (674)

TABLE 2.10

Eligibility Status as a
Function of Mother's Education

	Not there	0-7	8th	H.S.	H.S. Grad.	Some College	AA	BA/BS	Adv.
UC elig. rate	2%	4%	4%	8%	12%	19%	18%	29%	33%
CSUC elig. rate	22	18	19	22	33	41	39	51	60
Inelig. rate	78	82	81	78	67	59	61	49	40
TOTAL	100 (71)	100 (197)	100 (128)	100 (410)	100 (1351)	100 (889)	100 (272)	100 (481)	100 (286)

B. Non-academic Factors

In addition to academic achievement, a number of other factors influence a student's choice of post-secondary activities. For, while academic achievement determines the range of postsecondary options available to an individual graduate, other factors impact upon his or her selection among available options.

1. Experiences in the School

Both inside and outside of high school, members of the Class of '75 were exposed to a number of experiences which helped to shape their decisions about post-high school activities. In-school experiences included planning sessions with counselors, use of informational resources in the schools, and speakers about college and career opportunities. Each of these is discussed below.

a. Contact with High School Counselors

Nearly one-third of the graduates never discussed their post-high school plans with a school counselor. Another one-third discussed their plans with a school counselor on only one occasion. The remainder talked to their counselors more than once. Table 2.11 provides summary information on counselor contact for the Class of '75.

TABLE 2.11

Talking with Counselors Regarding Plans after Graduation

	Percent of Graduates
Talked with Counselor more than once	39%
Talked with Counselor once	32
Never talked with Counselor	29
TOTAL	100 (4131)

Minority and low-income graduates discussed their post-high school plans at a rate not significantly different than white students.

There were significant differences in the rate at which high, middle, and low-achieving students visited their counselors. However, it is not possible to determine from the survey whether the increased counselor visits were a result of high achievement or whether high achievement was a result of increased counselor visits. Table 2.12 presents data on contact with counselors by eligibility status.

TABLE 2.12

Contact with Counselors by Eligibility Status

	UC elig.	CSUC/ Not UC elig.	Inelig.	Total
Talked w/counselor more than once	50%	49%	34%	39%
Talked with counselors once	27	28	34	32
Never talked with counselor	23	23	32	29
TOTAL	100 (1158)	100 (1354)	100 (1619)	100 (4131)

Members of the Class of '75 who talked with their counselors had mixed feelings about the extent to which these discussions were helpful. Of those who saw their counselors once, 6 percent found the discussions about post-high school plans to be very helpful and 59 percent found them somewhat helpful. Students who saw their counselors more often generally found the sessions helpful: 86 percent classed them very helpful or somewhat helpful.

TABLE 2.13

Extent to Which Discussions with Counselors are Perceived as Being Helpful

	Students who talked w/counselors once	Students who talked w/counselors more than once
Discussions were Very Helpful	6%	22%
Discussions were Somewhat Helpful	59	64
Discussions were Not Helpful	35	14
TOTAL	100 (1235)	100 (1800)

There were no major ethnic variations in the extent to which discussions with counselors were perceived as being helpful. Asian students were somewhat more critical of their counselors than other students; Black and Chicano students were somewhat more supportive.

Students who did not discuss their future plans with their high school counselors gave several reasons for not having done so. Their responses to a question on this subject are summarized in Table 2.14 below.

TABLE 2.14

Reasons for not Seeing a High School Counselor

Didn't try - knew what I wanted to do	69%
Didnt' try - heard counselors were not helpful	22
Didn't try - too hard to get an appointment	8
Tried, but couldn't get appointment	1
TOTAL	100 (1037)

b. Other In-school Information Resources

Most high schools have career centers or sections in libraries or counseling offices where students may come to obtain written information on postsecondary opportunities. Most of the members of the Class of '75 felt that their schools were equipped with sufficient information on colleges and Universities, but were less convinced that there was sufficient information available to them on job opportunities and financial aid programs. Tables 2.15, .16, and .17 present student responses to a survey question on the in-school availability of information in three areas.

TABLE 2.15

Availability of Job Information in the High School

More than enough	11%
Enough	35
Not much	30
Don't know	24
TOTAL	100 (4119)

TABLE 2.16

Availability of College Information in the High School

More than enough	23%
Enough	52
Not much	13
Don't know	12
TOTAL	100 (4119)

TABLE 2.17

Availability of Financial Aid Information in the High School

Enough	38%
Not enough	23
Don't know	39
TOTAL	100 (4119)

c. Speakers About College and Career Opportunities

While in high school, most members of the Class of '75 heard at least one speaker about college or career opportunities. Table 2.18 presents information on the number of graduates who heard different types of speakers.

TABLE 2.18

Speakers in the High School

Speaker	Percent of Graduates who Heard Speaker
Armed Forces Representative	58%
Community College Representative	44
Vocational, Business, Tech School Representative	41
Professional in law, medicine, other field	29
UC Representative	26
CSUC Representative	24
Private college/University Representative	19
Private Business or Company	16
Union Representative	5

Interestingly, it appears as if the US Armed Forces have the most thorough coverage of California public high schools. Local Community Colleges and vocational/technical institutions also speak to a high percentage of high school students. Role models from business and the professions are, however, sadly lacking.

In Table 2.19, the graduates are subdivided according to eligibility status. Judging from the responses of these students, approximately one-half of the UC eligible students heard a representative from the University prior to graduating from high school. 39 percent of these high achieving students heard a representative from a private institution; 35 percent heard a CSUC representative. Of the CSUC eligible population, 33 percent heard a spokesperson from CSUC and 30 percent heard a representative of a private institution.

TABLE 2.19

College Representatives Heard by UC and CSUC Eligible Students

Speaker	% of UC Elig. who Heard	% of CSUC Elig. who Heard
UC representative	47%	
CSUC representative	35	32.7
Private College or Univ. rep.	39	30.1

Although the numbers in the sample are small, it appears as though proportionately more UC-eligible minority students heard a representative from the University than did their Anglo counterparts. Approximately 66 percent of the Blacks and 63 percent of the Chicanos in the UC-eligible sample report contact with a UC representative, as contrasted with 47.2 percent of the total eligible population. Similarly, CSUC eligible Black students reported a higher contact rate with CSUC representatives (56 percent) than did the full CSUC population (33 percent). However, Chicanos eligible to attend CSUC reported only slightly higher contact (38 percent) than the norm.

2. Influential People

Parents of members of Class of '75 were unquestionably the most influential in helping the graduates decide what to do after graduation. Among students who indicated that a single person was most influential, a full half of the respondents cited parents as filling this role. Parental influence was equally strong for minority and non-minority students, lower and upper income students.

One-half of the graduates indicated that "no one person" was most influential in the post-high school decision-making process. Other than those who mentioned parents, the remainder considered themselves, teachers, and friends most influential. Interestingly, school counselors and speakers in the schools scored almost equally. Table 2.20 provides summary information on influential people.

TABLE 2.20

Most Influential Person

No single person	50%
Parents	25
Myself	8
Teacher	5
Friend	6
Counselor	2
Speaker in high school	2
Community/church rep.	1
Other	1
TOTAL	100 (4106)

C. Educational Aspirations

In most cases, educational aspirations are formed by a complex combination of academic and non-academic experiences. These aspirations play a critical role in the determination of postsecondary options and in the choice from among those options.

Table 2.21 provides summary information on the educational aspirations of the Class of '75. For reasons described on page (lower response rate for ineligible students), these should be treated as high estimates.

Approximately one-third of the members of the Class of '75 do not plan to obtain a college degree of any kind during the next ten years. Some of these students have taken or plan to take occasional courses, but they do not expect to receive a degree. Of the remaining two-thirds of the Class, most plan on obtaining at least a Bachelor's degree.

TABLE 2.21

Educational Aspirations of Members of the Class of '75

Plan	Percent of Grads
Doctorate or other advanced degree	6%
Masters degree	12
Bachelor's degree	29
Two-year degree from a community college	18
Have gone, but won't continue in college	3
Will take occasional courses	9
No degree in next ten years	23
TOTAL	100.0 (4032)

There are significant differences in the educational aspirations of certain ethnic groups. As is evident in Table 2.22, Asian graduates had the highest aspirations of any ethnic group, with 74 percent of the respondents planning on obtaining at least a 4-year degree. A full 15 percent of the Chinese students and 10 percent of the Japanese students planned upon obtaining a doctorate.

While not as high as the Asians, black respondents also had higher educational aspirations than the norm. Only 19 percent of the blacks did not plan on obtaining a degree and a full 63 percent anticipated obtaining at least a bachelor's degree.

Chicano students had the lowest educational aspirations of any single ethnic group. The difference is particularly marked at the highest degree levels. Only 35 percent of the Chicano respondents planned on obtaining a Bachelor's or advanced University degree. This is less than half the proportion of Asian students anticipating 4-year or more degrees, and only slightly more than half the proportion of Black graduates.

TABLE 2.22

Educational Aspirations of the Graduates by Ethnic Status

Plans	Black	Chicano	Latino	Asian	Filip.	White/ Other
Doctorate or other advanced degree	7%	4%	10%	12%	3%	6%
Masters degree	16	8	14	22	7	12
Bachelor's degree	40	23	17	40	31	30
Two-year degree from a community college	18	24	24	17	17	16
Have gone, but won't continue in college	2	6	4	2	6	3
Will take occasional courses	5	11	7	2	12	9
No degree in next ten years	12	24	24	5	24	24
TOTAL	100 (193)	100 (348)	100 (89)	100 (224)	100 (40)	100 (2123)

Table 2.23 reports the educational aspirations of male and female graduates. As is evident in this table, degree aspirations differ markedly between the sexes. Significantly more women than men do not plan to obtain any degree at all. Over half of the men plan on obtaining at least a bachelor's degree; yet only 43 percent of the women have similar plans. These differences are particularly interesting in view of the higher achievement of women in high school, documented earlier in this report.

TABLE 2.23

Educational Aspirations of Men and Women Graduates

Plan	Men	Women
Doctorate or other advanced degree	8%	4%
Masters degree	14	11
Bachelor's degree	30	28
Two-year degree from a community college	17	28
Have gone, but won't continue in college	2	4
Will take occasional courses	8	10
No degree in next ten years	21	25
TOTAL	100 (1789)	100 (2243)

III. SELECTION AMONG AVAILABLE EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS

III. Selection Among Available Educational Options

A. Reasons for Selecting a Particular College

Once the members of the class of '75 had decided to attend college and had, by establishing a pattern of academic achievement, determined the range of options available to them, the college selection process got fully underway. For many graduates--particularly the low-achievers--the selection process was not particularly complicated, for the options available to them were severely limited. The highest achievers, on the other hand, were faced with a vast array of institutional choices.

In general, location, cost, and type of program offered were the most important considerations when the '75 graduates selected a college. These were followed closely by the academic reputation of the institution and friends who attended the institution. Table 3.1 provides summary information on reasons for college selection.

TABLE 3.1

Reasons for College Selection

	Percent of Graduates Citing as Reason for College Choice
Program	57%
Locale	55
Cost	41
Academic Reputation	27
Friend	22
Parents	17
Entry Requirements	17
Financial Aid	14
(N)	(3460)

The above-listed factors varied in significance for students with different ethnic and eligibility characteristics. Factors deemed insignificant for certain populations assumed much greater importance for others. One of the clearest examples of this difference is student financial aid, which was cited as a significant consideration by only 10 percent of the white graduates but by over 35 percent of the Black graduates.

UC-Eligible Students

The three major influences on all students--location, cost, and type of program--were also cited by most UC-eligible students as major factors in their institutional choices. However, the location of the institution assumed more importance for the UC-eligible population than for the total class. In addition, the academic reputation of the institution was significantly more important to this population than to the entire class (56 percent v. 27 percent). As might be expected, entrance requirements were significantly less important to this population (9 percent v. 17 percent).

Within the UC-eligible population, there were significant differences in the extent to which certain factors affected students of different ethnic groups. For example, almost four times as many Black and Chicano as white eligibles cited financial aid as a reason for selecting a particular college. Also, academic reputation was considerably more important to Black and Chinese eligibles, than to the eligible population as a whole. The numbers of such students in the sample are, however, very small. Table 3.2 provides information on the eligible population.

TABLE 3.2

Reasons for College Selection:
UC Eligible Students by Race

	Black	Chicano/Latino	Asian	White/Other	Total
Program	69%	62%	49%	57%	57%
Locale	55	72	67	69	69
Cost	25	33	38	41	40
Acad. Rep.	75	53	59	55	55
Friend	3	22	30	19	20
Parent	25	13	25	19	20
Entry	3	12	12	8	9
Aid	56	37	27	15	18
(N)	(27)	(45)	(117)	(947)	(1136)

When the eligible graduates are sub-divided according to the institution they attended further differences emerge. For example, cost was most important to those who attended CSUC and least important to those who attended private institutions. Academic reputation was the most important factor in the decision of those who chose UC, less important to those who chose CSUC.

TABLE 3.3

Reason for College Selection:
UC Eligibles, by Institution Attended

	Attended UC	Attended CSUC	Attended private	Went elsewhere
Program	58%	66%	71%	59%
Locale	73	76	58	60
Cost	21	55	4	32
Acad. Rep.	81	39	73	58
Friend	20	26	10	16
Parent	19	16	22	21
Entry	7	11	3	6
Aid	18	9	46	32
(N)	(423)	(227)	(134)	(91)

CSUC Eligible Students

CSUC eligible graduates were similar to all graduates in their reasons for choosing a particular college. Locale, program, and cost were the primary reasons for selecting a college. Like the UC eligible population, CSUC eligibles from different ethnic groups were influenced to varying degrees by individual factors. The differences were not, however, as marked as within the UC population.

TABLE 3.4

Reasons for College Selection:
CSUC Eligible Students, by Race

	Black	Chicano/Latino	Asian	White/Other	Total
Program	65%	51%	46%	54%	50%
Locale	55	60	63	61	55
Cost	35	37	41	42	43
Acad. Rep.	49	34	47	37	25
Friend	9	15	26	19	17
Parent	21	13	20	17	15
Entry	10	15	14	12	14
Aid	49	32	24	12	14
(N)	(57)	(348)	(173)	(1842)	(1200)

B. The Colleges Selected by the Graduates[4]

The data presented below describe the institutional choices of the members of the Class of '75. For reasons detailed earlier in this report, they should be treated as somewhat inflated estimates of actual attendance patterns.

Of the entire graduating class,

- 6.7% enrolled in UC
- 9.6% enrolled in CSUC
- 47.6% enrolled in CCC
- 4.1% enrolled in Independent Colleges
- 3.9% enrolled in out-of-state institutions
- 4.9% enrolled in Vocational Schools
- 23.2% did not further their educations

[4]Because graduates attended postsecondary institutions in virtually endless combinations and sequences, tables in this section were simplified for purposes of clarity. Rather than reporting on all institutions attended by each student, these tables report on the highest level institution attended by the student. For example, if a student started in a two-year institution then transferred to a four-year institution, s/he appears in these tables as a student attending a four-year institution. Further studies may examine order of attendance.

Available data, although scanty, suggest that this split is not atypical of recent graduating classes.

UC Eligible Graduates

Enrollment patterns differ substantially for different eligibility groups. Table 3.5 provides summary data on the institutional choices of UC eligible graduates. For the most part, the high achieving graduates stayed inside California for their postsecondary education--with only 7 percent leaving the State. A full four-fifths of the UC eligibles entered public colleges or Universities and 11.7 percent entered private colleges.

TABLE 3.5

Colleges Attended by UC Eligible Graduates, by Sex

	UC eligible Men	UC eligible Women	Total UC eligibles
Enrolled in UC	39%	34%	36%
Enrolled in CSUC	18	21	20
Enrolled in CCC	22	24	23
Enrolled in independent college	12	11	12
Enrolled in out-of-state institution	6	8	7
Enrolled in vocational school	1	1	1
Did not enroll	2	1	1
TOTAL	100 (524)	100 (634)	100 (1158)

As is evident in Table 3.5 high achieving women attended college at a rate not significantly different than their male counterparts. However, their choices among institutions were substantially different. A significantly smaller proportion of the women chose the University of California, with greater numbers enrolling in CCC, and CSUC. The proportions of men and women enrolling in independent colleges were nearly identical.

The number of ethnic minorities in the UC eligible sample is too small to permit reliable use of survey responses to measure differences in the institutional choices of students from different ethnic groups. With supplemental data from the University of California

Registration Information System, however, it is possible to identify differences with respect to enrollment in the University of California. Table 3.6 compares survey information on the ethnic composition of the UC eligibility pool with data on the ethnic composition of UC freshmen who were regularly admitted[5] in Fall '77.

TABLE 3.6

A Comparison of the UC Eligibility Pool (Adjusted, weighted Estimates) and the UC regular admit Freshman Population by Ethnic Group (Fall, 1977)

	(1) UC eligibles	(2) UC Freshman Regulars	Ratio of (2)/(1)
Black	2.5%	2.8%	1.12%
Chicano/Latino	4.0	4.3	1.08
Pilipino	0.5	1.1	2.2
Asian	9.4	12.1	1.29
White/Other	83.6	79.7	.95
(N)	(1158)	(14,664)	

Based upon this comparison, it seems that regularly-admissable minority students enroll in the University at a greater rate than regularly-admissable white students. Eligible Asian and Pilipino students appear to have the highest UC-enrollment rate.

As was noted above, the choices of these students--other than those who chose UC--are difficult to monitor because of the size of the sample. It appears, though, that beyond the proportionately greater choice of UC, proportionately more of these high achieving Black and Brown students chose private institutions than did their counterparts.

[5] Students admitted in exception to published criteria were not included in these totals.

CSUC Eligible Population

Table 3.7 provides summary information on the institutional choices of CSUC eligible students. Approximately 7 percent of these students did not enroll in a college at all and an additional 6 percent attended out-of-state institutions.

TABLE 3.7

Colleges Selected by CSUC Eligible Students

	CSUC eligible Men	CSUC eligible Women	Total CSUC eligible
Enrolled in UC	22%	16%	18%
Enrolled in CSUC	21	21	21
Enrolled in CCC	34	38	37
Enrolled in Independent college	10	8	9
Enrolled out-of-state	6	6	6
Enrolled in Vocational school	1	3	2
Did not enroll	6	8	7
TOTAL	100 (1036)	100 (1476)	100 (2512)

The information in Table 3.7 suggests that enrollment patterns for CSUC eligible female graduates differed from enrollment patterns of male graduates. A larger proportion of the women chose community colleges, vocational schools, or did not enroll in any postsecondary institution. Smaller proportions of the women chose private institutions. Smaller proportions of the women chose UC as well, but this is due in part to their ineligibility to attend UC.

Table 3.8 compares survey information on the ethnic composition of the CSUC eligibility pool with data on the ethnic composition of CSUC freshmen who were regularly admitted in Fall '77.

The Colleges Selected by the Graduates -- CSUC Eligible Students

TABLE 3.8

A Comparison of the CSUC Eligibility Pool (Adjusted, weighted Estimates) and the CSUC Regular Admit Freshman Population[6] by Ethnic Group

	(1) CSUC eligibles	(2) CSUC Freshman Regulars	Ratio of (2)/(1)
Black	2.8%	3.6%	1.29%
Chicano/Latino	6.7	5.7	.85
Pilipino	.9	1.3	1.44
Asian	6.3	8.0	1.27
White/Other	83.3.	81.4	.98
(N)	(2512)	(14,043)	

Judging from this comparisor, it seems that CSUC eligible Black and Asian graduates enroll in CSUC at a greater rate than do White eligibles. Chicano/Latino graduates, on the other hand, appear to enroll in CSUC at a somewhat lower rate.

Ineligible Population

A sizeable proportion (at least 32 percent) of students ineligible to attend either of the four-year public segments did not enroll in any college whatsoever. Those who did attend college, enrolled primarily in two-year institutions. Clearly, these students had very limited institutional choices. Because of weighting problems with this segment of the student responses, no table is included on colleges selected by students ineligible to attend UC or CSUC.

[6] These data were furnished by the Chancellor's Office at the California State University and Colleges. They are acquired from students on a voluntary basis during the registration process, and all percentages are calculated using the number of students who reported ethnicity as a base. Unfortunately, 35.3% of the freshmen did not report ethnic status.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE GRADUATES

IV. Comments from the Graduates

At the conclusion of the questionnaire, members of the Class of '75 were asked the following question:

> "If there is anything else about your experiences during or since high school that you thought we should know about, please use the space below to tell us about it."

Surprisingly large numbers of graduates (1754) responded to this question, many writing fairly lengthy commentaries on their high school experiences. In their responses, most students were severely critical of their high school experiences.

The most common criticism pertained to the quality of courses taught in high school--courses which, in the opinion of the graduates, failed to prepare them for their postsecondary activities. The comments below are typical and are exerpted as is from the survey responses.

> "I graduated from High School as an honor student, but discovered in Jr. College that I was unprepared. My high school education was terrible. I can't spell; can't study correctly; don't know how to research; no vocabulary; algebra in high school but had to start over in college. How silly, what a waste of time to have to take subjects over again in college that I passed with "A" grades in high school!..."

> "I look back to high school and feel like I wasted 4 years."

> "The educational quality of the particular school which I attended was very low. A classic example of wholesale education, where students are "pushed" through and handed a high school diploma, some, not learning even how to read. Others, including myself, totaly unprepared for a real academic Institution."

> "Compared to college, the workload and academic life was, and still is, a joke. The XXX XXX city school system is fooling people into thinking they are offering students an education. If one plans to work at a store as a box boy, then he may be prepared. If, on the other hand, one wants to attend college, especially a difficult one, forget the idea of being prepared. You aren't!"

> "I didn't feel that high school prepared me well enough for college ... There should be better preparatory classes for college..!!"

> "Public high school system in California is terrible. It is far too easy. Classes should be tougher and there should be more requirements to be met by all students. I feel like I could have skipped all of high school and still be where I am."

"Many individuals, including myself, feel that their high school education was a complete waste of time. ... we find college a bit difficult at times due to the lack of learning basic necessities in English, math, history ... Could not the high school systems be revamped?"

"High school was to easy to slide through with out doing hardly any work and even if all that was required was completed it wasn't enough to prepare for college. Classes didn't require enough work from the students."

"I think the instructors of high schools should discipline and teach stricter than they do. For my opinion I did not learn what I was suppose to in each class, but still the instructors passed me ..."

"I don't feel I deserved my High School diploma, (I did get one.) There are thousands of high school student each year who receive a diploma, and can't read higher than the 5th or 6th grade level. When I first went to XXXX College I was surprised in myself, to know how little I knew, but I'm making a strong and serious comeback. There should be some sort of graduation test ..."

"I don't think the high school standards are high enough. I am fairly smart so I never cracked a book ... They are graduating illiterates. My brother is finally learning to read, write, and spell in college."

"...I really believe that even though throughout my high school years I took college prep courses, my high school education did not prepare me for college."

"I'm just glad I'm back in college where education is taken seriously. Something must be done about our school system. High school is the worst experience I've ever had!"

"I'm greatful to be in college. I'm generally pleased with the system. I was disgusted with high school ... My desire and ability to learn have always been strong, but I was always faced with the turkey level. Not even the MGM courses were a challenge.

Some of the respondents were even more specific in pointing to areas in which they felt particularly unprepared. Witness the following excerpts:

"I was not prepared enough in the areas of Math, Physics, and Chemistry. Although they were available, I had no idea how much I would regret not having been informed about how important they were for the XXX System.

"My English classes all through high school were terrible! I never learned any grammar, parts of speech, or even how to write a decent composition and I found a lot of difficulty passing a beginning english class at XXX."

"My high school prepared me very poorly for College. The areas I really felt the poorest in were language, grammar, and paper writing, even though in high school I did very well in these areas."

"I have found many people in college, including myself, have never learned to write a simple English paper correctly. The English classes I had in high school mostly consisted of watching a movie on television and verbally explaining the plot to my teacher."

"I think that one of the most important vocational skills neglected by the XXXX System is writing."

Many of the survey respondents addressed the informational aspects of the preparation issue. Most of these wished they had been informed early on of the importance of taking particular courses. Some of their criticisms were directed at counselors, some more generally.

"If there was one thing I wish I had in high school, it would be a Required career corce."

"...when a student reaches high-school, there should be specific branches of education available to he or she. ...so that a student can be prepared for college, and know before-hand what courses to take ..."

"My High School counselors had alot of information about different careers, but gave me alot of wrong information pertaining to my career as a XXX. In college I had to take alot of courses I should have taken in High School but did not know because of the counselors."

"Counseling in the high school systems could definitely stand improvement. I am currently enrolled in courses which I should have had in high school."

"It wasn't until I was a junior in H.S. that I learned the requirements for admission to the XXX System. Thus, I screwed around while young and learned the truth, then worked like a dog to catch up with good grades. Too late, though, I didn't have the right classes and ...g.p.a. Too bad someone didn't tell me."

"First of all, I would like to criticize the role of my high school counselors. Not only were they not helpful, at times they were potentially hurtful."

"I think school counselors should help the students prepare for college more, by telling them about the classes they should take before entering college."

"The counselors should have been more useful in giving classes on to prepare for college. I felt they were just interested in getting you out of High School ..."

"Counselors only were interested in speaking to those students who had very high grade points."

"Students should be more informed about college during their high school years."

"...Also, the counselors were definitely incompetent. They had no sincere interest in helping the less gifted or problem students and this was clearly visible."

"High schools should inform students more on what's needed for various careers and not just requirements. Too often requirements are only a minimum and students are not prepared for advanced College or University levels."

"My counselor at XXX really bummed me out. His mistake has cost me a year, possibly two years extra. This totally upsets me to know that one person supposedly knows his job but in actuality he didn't and I'm paying for it."

"I feel that career objectives should be exposed to Jr. High students. By the time my school began career counseling, I was a senior and it was too late for me to begin preparing."

Several additional themes ran throughout the remaining responses. First, a number of students spoke very positively about their high schools. Those who did, often cited good teacher/student relations and talked in glowing terms about career experience programs. "ROP" a regional occupational program, received several kudos. Second, many of the students talked about the importance of good teachers--and complained about the small numbers of good teachers in their high schools. Several students recommended rather drastic steps to deal with this problem. And third, a fair number of respondents chose to focus their comments on aspects of reverse discrimination. A good deal of emotion was vented in several of these responses.

In sum, the majority of students responding to the open-ended question criticized their high schools in rather harsh terms for not effectively preparing them for college and careers. Many of the respondents suggested stricter classroom standards--both academic and disciplinary. These comments on preparation fell in two major categories: (1) those from students who took a full academic program but didn't feel that they learned much from their classes and (2) those from students who say they didn't take a full academic program because no one had told them how important such a program would be after graduation. High school guidance systems came in for particularly severe criticism.

Perhaps the most severe criticism of all, however, was levelled indirectly in the following response:

"He graduated from high school and all lower education schools and has not learned to read. Colleges are not easy for him to get into when he cannot read accurately. Junior colleges such as XXX do not teach reading. I (his sister) asked him the questions and the choice answers to fill out this questionnaire."

V. CONCLUSIONS

V. Conclusions

As was detailed in the previous pages and highlighted in the Introduction, the principal findings of the study are as follows:

1. Most California high school graduates enter a college or University within two years after graduation. A full 98 percent of the highest achieving graduates (UC-eligibles) in the Class of '75 went on to college, and 93 percent of the graduates who placed in the upper one-third of their class (CSUC-eligibles) went on to college. Of the total graduate population, more than two-thirds (and perhaps as high as three-quarters) continued their education beyond high school.

2. The post secondary activities of high school graduates with similar achievement characteristics did not vary according to the race or economic background of the graduates. College attendance rates for all groups were similar; as were their institutional choices. In other words, California's educational system appears to be working with equal effectiveness for students of equal achievement regardless of background.

3. Minority and low-income students and students whose parents received little formal education were not evenly distributed among high school achievement groups. These students achieved UC eligibility with only one-third the frequency of other students and achieved CSUC eligibility with less than one-half the frequency of other students.

4. Because of inadequate preparation and achievement in high school, minority and low-income students and students whose parents received little formal education are being systematically excluded from 4 year colleges and Universities in California. The postsecondary options of those students are significantly more limited than those of other students.

In addition, although the survey instrument did not address this issue directly, it is clear from the graduates' responses to the open-ended question that a large number of those students who entered college after graduation did not feel that their high schools prepared them adequately for college course work. Graduates faulted both high school guidance systems and the quality of high school instruction in basic skill areas.

APPENDICES

BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION: WHAT NEXT?

A Survey of 1974 & 1975 High School Graduates

SURVEY OF RECENT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

- Please try to answer every question. If you can't remember or aren't sure, do the best you can.

- We want your answers and your opinions. Please fill in the questionnaire by yourself. Your name was drawn in a scientific sample of all 1974-75 high school graduates, and no other graduate can substitute for you.

- Please read the directions carefully -- ESPECIALLY THOSE IN HEAVY TYPE LIKE THIS.

- As soon as you finish filling out the questionnaire, please mail it back in the enclosed stamped envelope as soon as possible.

- Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. The number will help tell us which people's questionnaires have arrived, and which need reminder letters or phone calls. But no one will ever know and no one will try to find out who said what.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Survey Research Center
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

February 1, 1977

1-4/

1. When did you graduate from high school? 7/

   1☐ July - Sept, 1974
   2☐ Oct - Dec, 1974
   3☐ Jan - Mar, 1975
   4☐ Apr - June; 1975
   5☐ Some other time (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____)

2. From which high school did you graduate?

   Name of High School: _____

   City: _____

3. How many different high schools did you attend? 8/

   1☐ One
   2☐ Two
   3☐ Three
   4☐ Four or more

4. Did you ever talk with a high school counselor about what you should do after high school graduation? 9/

   1☐ Yes, once
   2☐ Yes, more than once
   3☐ No, never

5. If you did discuss your future plans, how helpful was the counselor? 10/

   0☐ I did not discuss plans with a high school counselor
   1☐ Very helpful
   2☐ Somewhat helpful
   3☐ Not helpful

11/1

6. If you did not discuss your future plans with a counselor, what were your reasons?

0 ☐ I did discuss plans with a high school counselor 12/

1 ☐ I didn't try because I knew what I wanted to do, didn't need help

2 ☐ I didn't try because I heard the counselors were not helpful

3 ☐ I didn't try because it was too hard to get an appointment

4 ☐ I tried, but could not get an appointment

7. How much information did your high school have available about job opportunities after high school?

1 ☐ More than enough information 13/

2 ☐ Enough information

3 ☐ Not much information

4 ☐ I don't know how much

8. How much information did your high school have available about colleges?

1 ☐ More than enough information 14/

2 ☐ Enough information

3 ☐ Not much information

4 ☐ I don't know how much

9. How much information did your high school have available about financial aid for students who need help to go to college?

1 ☐ Enough information 15/

2 ☐ Not enough

3 ☐ I don't know how much

10. Did you take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or the American College Testing (ACT) which many California colleges require for admission? (These are usually given on the weekend.)

1 ☐ Took both SAT and ACT 16/

2 ☐ Took SAT only

3 ☐ Took ACT only

4 ☐ Took at least one, but not sure which

5 ☐ Neither

6 ☐ Not sure (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____) 17/

11. How many people came to your high school to speak to students about different colleges and careers?

18/

1☐A lot of different speakers came
2☐Not many different speakers came
3☐No speakers came

12. Which of the following kinds of people did you hear at your high school (before you graduated)?

PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT YOU HEARD

☐This does not apply to me because no speakers came — 19/
☐Armed Forces representative (Army, Navy, Air Force, etc.) — 20/
☐Union representative, talking about apprenticeships — 21/
☐Someone from a vocational, business or technical school who talked about job training — 22/
☐Someone from a private company or business — 23/
☐Someone in a profession, who told you about careers in law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, teaching, or other professions — 24/
☐Someone from a junior college or community college — 25/
☐Someone from the University of California — 26/
☐Someone from the California State University and College System — 27/
☐Someone from a private college or university — 28/
☐Someone else (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____) — 29/ 30/
☐I did not hear any of the above kinds of people at my high school — 31/ 32/

13. Who was the most influential in helping you to decide what to do after graduation?

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

1☐One of the speakers checked above — 33/
2☐My parents or other relatives
3☐High school counselors
4☐High school teachers
5☐Community or church group
6☐My friends
7☐Someone else (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____)
8☐No one person

34/

14. How have you spent most of your time since high school graduation?

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

1 ☐ I went to school or college most of the time 35/
2 ☐ I worked most of the time
3 ☐ I kept house most of the time
4 ☐ I travelled most of the time
5 ☐ Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____)

15. Please fill in the following table to show the different kinds of paying jobs you may have had after high school graduation. Use one line for each. If you held more than 5 paying jobs, please list the 5 most recent.

Dates Worked From Mo/Yr	Dates Worked To Mo/Yr	Kind of Job or Work Done	Was this part-time or full-time?	
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time	36-37/ 38-39/
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time	
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time	40-41/ 42-43/
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time	
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time	

☐ No paying jobs since high school graduation 44/

16. If there were any periods after high school (not counting vacations) when you were not working, what was the main reason?

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

0 ☐ I have been working steadily, no period after high school when I wasn't 45/
1 ☐ I couldn't find steady work
2 ☐ I didn't want a steady job, had other things to do
3 ☐ I was going to school or college

46/V

17. Please list the full name and location of every school (including vocational, trade and technical schools), every college and every university that you applied to (for additional education or training after high school).

Name of school, college or university	✓	City/State where located

☐ I did not apply to any schools after high school.

18. Which, if any, of these places accepted you as a student? PLEASE REMEMBER THAT WE WANT TO KNOW ABOUT THE SCHOOLS THAT ACCEPTED YOU FOR ADMISSION, NOT WHICH ONES PROMISED FINANCIAL AID.

☐ None of the above schools accepted me for admission

☐ I have checked (in the middle column above) those that accepted me as a student (including any that accepted me but turned down my grant application)

19. Did you apply for a grant, scholarship, or other kind of financial aid?

1 ☐ No, I didn't apply for financial aid for college 47/
2 ☐ Yes, I applied and I got at least some financial aid
3 ☐ Yes, I applied but I did not get any financial aid

20. If you were accepted by one or more colleges but did not attend any, why did you decide not to go to college?

48/

PLEASE EXPLAIN: _____

49/

_____

50/

_____

51/

52/

21. Have you attended any schools since graduation? If so, please fill in the names of all schools attended together with the dates and part/full-time status.

Dates Attended From Mo/Yr	Dates Attended To Mo/Yr	School, College or University	Was this part-time or full-time?
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time
			☐ Full time ☐ Part time

☐ No, have not attended any schools or colleges since high school 53/

22. If you have attended school or college since high school graduation: What were your reasons for going to the school or college you went to? IF YOU WENT TO MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL OR COLLEGE, PLEASE ANSWER ABOUT THE ONE YOU WENT TO FOR THE LONGEST TIME.

PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

☐ This does not apply to me. I haven't gone to college. 54/
☐ Because costs were low 55/
☐ Because I could get financial aid there (student loan, scholarship, grant, etc.) 56/
☐ Because it offered the program I wanted 57/
☐ Because of the entrance requirements 58/
☐ Because of its academic reputation 59/
☐ Because my parents wanted me to go there 60/
☐ Because I had friends going there 61/
☐ Because I liked its location 62/
☐ Because of other reasons (PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR REASONS: _____) 63/ 64/ 65/

66-80/

1-4/
5-6/02

23. A. If you have not attended school or college since high school graduation: Do your plans for the next three years include going to school?

7/

0☐ This does not apply to me. I have attended school or college since high school

1☐ Yes

2☐ No

B. On what basis do you think you'll be going to school?

8/

0☐ This does not apply to me because I won't be going to school at any time in the next three years

0☐ This does not apply to me because I have attended or am attending college

1☐ I'll go to a vocational, technical or trade school or college and get a diploma or certificate

2☐ I'll take a few college courses for fun or just for my own interest

3☐ I'll take a few college courses to help me in my work

4☐ I'll go to college and work toward a degree

5☐ I'll do something else in school (PLEASE DESCRIBE: _____)

24. Do you expect to get a college degree in the next 10 years? If so, what kind?

9/

1☐ No, I probably won't get a degree in the next 10 years

2☐ I have gone, (or now go), but do not plan to continue in college

3☐ I'll probably just take the courses I need or like without getting a college degree

4☐ I'll probably get a 2-year degree from a junior college

5☐ I'll probably get a Bachelor's degree from a 4-year college or university

6☐ I'll probably get a Master's degree

7☐ I'll probably get a Doctorate or other advanced degree

In order to learn how well California's education system is serving high school graduates from different backgrounds, we need some information about you personally and about your family. Please answer as many of the following questions as you possibly can.

25. Where were you born? *52/*

1 ☐ In California
2 ☐ In another part of the U.S.
3 ☐ In another country

26. Are you male or female? *53/*

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

27. Not counting yourself, how many people lived in your household during your last year of high school?

I lived with _____ other people *54-55/*

28. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

☐ None _____ brothers and _____ sisters *56-57/*

IF YOU HAVE BROTHERS OR SISTERS: How many of your brothers and sisters are 18 - 25 years old?

☐ None _____ brothers and _____ sisters 18 - 25 years old *58-59/*

29. A. When you were growing up, which languages did the people in your home normally speak to each other? *60/*

1 ☐ English
2 ☐ Chinese
3 ☐ Japanese
4 ☐ Spanish
5 ☐ Tagalog
6 ☐ Other (WHICH? _____)

B. IF TWO OR MORE LANGUAGES WERE SPOKEN IN YOUR HOME: Which was the major language spoken by your parents? (Which was used most?)

My parents usually spoke: _____ *61/*

62/

30. Which of the following comes closest to describing your race or ethnic group?

63-64/

01 ☐ Black or Afro-American
02 ☐ Chicano or Mexican-American
03 ☐ Latino or other Spanish-American
04 ☐ Chinese or Chinese-American
05 ☐ Japanese or Japanese-American
06 ☐ Filipino/Pilipino
07 ☐ Other Asian-American
08 ☐ White or Caucasian
☐ Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE:_____)

31. Many people are not able to get as much education as they would like. What was the highest grade or year of regular school your parents were able to complete? Please check one box in the left column for your mother and one box in the right column for your father to show their education. (IF YOU WERE LIVING WITH SOMEONE ELSE WHILE YOU WERE IN HIGH SCHOOL, PLEASE ANSWER FOR YOUR STEP-MOTHER OR FATHER, YOUR ADOPTED PARENTS, OR WHOEVER TOOK THE PLACE OF YOUR PARENTS.)

65/ Your mother or whoever took your mother's place		Your father or whoever took your father's place	66/
1 ☐	Less than 8th grade (or no formal schooling)	1 ☐	
2 ☐	Graduated from 8th grade only	2 ☐	
3 ☐	Went to high school (9th grade or more) but did not graduate	3 ☐	
4 ☐	High school graduate, no college	4 ☐	
5 ☐	Some college, but no degree	5 ☐	
6 ☐	Graduated from 2-year junior college	6 ☐	
7 ☐	Graduated from 4-year college or university	7 ☐	
8 ☐	Did graduate work or got graduate degree	9 ☐	
9 ☐ I did not live with my mother and no one took her place when I was in high school		9 ☐ I did not live with my father and no one took his place when I was in high school	

32. How would you describe your family's economic condition at the time you were growing up? IF IT VARIED, PLEASE ANSWER FOR YOUR SENIOR YEAR IN HIGH SCHOOL.

67/

1 ☐ We were well off, could afford almost anything we wanted
2 ☐ We had all that we needed and some extras
3 ☐ We didn't have much extra, but we had what we really needed
4 ☐ There were times when we couldn't afford things we really needed
5 ☐ Things were always tough financially

33. About how much total income (before taxes) did your family have during your last year of high school? PLEASE INCLUDE ALL SOURCES, INCLUDING ANYTHING YOU AND ANY OTHER CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY CONTRIBUTED, ETC.

69/

1 ☐ Under $6,000
2 ☐ $6,000 - $11,999
3 ☐ $12,000 - $17,999
4 ☐ $18,000 - $24,999
5 ☐ $25,000 or more

34. When you were a high school senior, did you contribute to the support of your family?

70/

1 ☐ No, I did not help
2 ☐ I helped pay my own expenses
3 ☐ I gave money to my family to help pay the family's bills

35. Do you now help support your parents or your brothers or your sisters?

71/

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

36. If there is anything else about your experiences during or since high school that you think we should know about, please use the space below to tell us about it.

72/

AND NOW, PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU DIDN'T FORGET TO ANSWER A QUESTION.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

APPENDIX B

Glossary of Terms

1. UC Admissions Requirements: In order to gain admission to UC, a student must obtain a 3.1 grade point average in a specified set of required courses. Students with g.p.a.'s in required courses which fall between 3.0 to 3.09 may gain entrance if their combined scores on the SAT and CEEB achievement tests are sufficiently high. These requirements have been in effect since 1967, but will be replaced with a modified set of requirements beginning with applicants for Fall, 1979.

2. CSUC Admissions Requirements: Admission to the CSUC system is determined by a combination of high school grade point average and scores on standardized tests. The Eligibility Index used by CSUC is established at a level which results in the upper one-third of the high school graduating class being eligible to enter CSUC.

3. "A-F Requirements": The set of courses which all applicants to the UC system must have completed in high school. Includes three years English, two years mathematics, one year Laboratory Science, and so on.

4. UC- or CSUC-Eligible Student: A student who meets the requirements for admission to UC or CSUC.